



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,350	04/04/2001	Jesse Perla	1351829.0013	1421
25681	7590	04/06/2004	EXAMINER	
ORMISTON & MCKINNEY, PLLC 802 W. BANNOCK STREET, SUITE 400 P.O. BOX 298 BOISE, ID 83701-0298			NGUYEN, VAN H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	
DATE MAILED: 04/06/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/825,350	PERLA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VAN H NGUYEN	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to amendment A filed January 27, 2004.
2. Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

Priority

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Canada on January 31, 2000. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 2,297,711 - 2,297,597- 2,297,596 applications as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Objections

4. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claim 3, the phrase "an uniform resource locator" (line 3) should read "a uniform resource locator"

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 4, the following phrases lack antecedent basis:

-“the parent application” (lines 5-6)

-“ the child application” (lines 6-7)

7. Dependent claims 5-6 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lemay et al.** “Microsoft FrontPage 98” Sams.net Publishing 1997, pp. 102-134.

9. **As to claim 1**, Lemay teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for facilitating application reuse in web-based applications (*pp. 102 and 133*), the method comprising the steps of:

- providing a distributed application having parent and child components (*fig. 7.14; page 102 and fig. 8.16; page 133*), the parent component being served by first server and the child component being served by a second server (*as shown in figs. 7.14, page 102 and 7.21, page 109, the components such as “home” and “product 1” could be stored in and retrieved from different servers*);

- specifying a link to the child component on the second server using a linked application form in the parent component (*e.g., providing links to the added items; fig. 7.18, page 106 or providing links to all the product sheets; fig. 7.21, page 109*);
- supplying the child component with a context identifying the parent component and the first server (*fig. 7.14; page 102*) ; and

Lemay does not explicitly teach “defining, using an exit form and the generated context, a flow that returns from a the child component and continues in the parent component.”

Lemay, however, discloses [Home] at the bottom of figs. 7.18, 7.20, 7.21, and 7.23. Activating this link will exit the child page and return to the parent page.

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Lemay for “*defining, using an exit form and the generated context, a flow that returns from a the child component and continues in the parent component*” in order to provide a means for quick return to the parent page from the child page.

10. **As to claim 2,** Lemay teaches supplying the child component with a context identifying the first server, the parent component (*fig. 7.14; page 102*), and an exit point (*fig. 7.18; page 106*). As to “defining, using the exit form and the context, a flow that returns from the child

component and continues at the exit point in the parent component” note the discussion of claim 1 above for rejection.

11. **As to claim 3**, Lemay teaches specifying a link to the child component on the second server using a linked application form, providing the linked application with an uniform resource locator corresponding to the child component (*figs. 7.18 and 7.21*).

12. **As to claim 4**, the rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. However, claim 4, further recites “serving the child component with a first server so that the child component can be navigated to an exit form.”

Lemay teaches serving the child component with a first server so that the child component can be navigated to an exit form (*fig. 7.21; page 109*).

13. **As to claim 5**, Lemay teaches serving the parent component with a second server so that the parent application can be navigated to a linked application form that supplies a link to the child application in the form of a uniform resource locator (*figs. 7.18, and 7.21*).

14. **As to claim 6**, Lemay teaches directing, to the exit point of the parent component, a request made through the exit form (*figs. 7.18, 7.20, 7.21, and 7.23*).

15. **As to claim 7**, it includes the same limitation as claim 4, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Claim 7, however, further recites a run time processor.

Lemay teaches a run time processor (*e.g., the web server*).

16. **As to claim 8**, Lemay teaches the linked application form of the parent application includes a uniform resource locator corresponding to the child component (*figs. 7.18, and 7.21*).

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments filed on January 27, 2004 have been fully considered, but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(x). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(x).

19. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2126

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 306-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VHN



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100